

**USBR/Western Customer Funding Program**

**Technical Committee Meeting**

**January 16, 2003**

**At Western Area Power Administration**

**Approved Minutes**

**1. Call to order by Chairman/Secretary**

**2. Roll Call (Normal attendees; x marks attendees; p-phone in)**

( X ) Charles Cooper, Western (M) ( X ) Bill Reichmann, SVP (M) ( ) Joe Ungvari, DOE (A)  
( ) Cyndi Eckler, Western (L) ( X ) Ed Roman, SMUD (M) ( X ) Mark Clark, DOE (M)  
( X ) Janice Bartlett, Western (L) ( X ) Barry Mortimeyer, USBR (M) ( ) Russ Klein, BART (M)  
( ) Brian Sprague, Western (L) ( X ) Tom Ruthford, USBR (L) ( ) Al Zepp, NCPA (A)  
( ) Deb Deitz, Western ( X ) Martin Bauer, USBR (A) ( ) Jerry Toenyes, NCPA  
( X ) Bob Parkins, Western ( ) Dan Netto, USBR (A) ( ) Stuart Robertson, Irrigation (M)  
( P ) Tom Kabat, Palo Alto (M) ( X ) Bernard Erlich, Palo Alto (A) ( ) Lowell Watros, Redding (M)  
( X ) Mike Bloom, Roseville

**3. Review Prior Minutes** – Approved the November 19, 2002 Minutes of last T/C.

**4. Reports** – Reclamation mentioned their efforts to determine what limitations the Shasta isolated phase bus rating (connecting generators to step-up transformer) may have with the operations of the uprated generators after new runners are installed. An inspection of this bus by Reclamation's Technical Service Center staff discovered parts of the copper were blue which could be interpreted as an indication of excessive temperature. This led to questioning whether the iso-phase bus could handle the output of the 142-MW rating. Reclamation will be pursuing answers to this issue over the next couple of months to include determining if replacement is necessary or addition of cooling would be viable. Funds remain in the Shasta Rewind Contract to handle replacement of the iso-phase bus should that be the alternative selected. (See Action Item 11-19-2002-02 below)

A second Shasta related item discussed involved the Temperature Control Device (TCS) and 5 unit operation. The TCD was designed to withstand load rejection of 5 units running at 125-MW and 19,500 CFS flow. This should be considered and evaluated further before it is decided to uprate all 5 units to 142-MW. On the other hand, if all units were uprated to 142-MW, operating procedures can be easily established to operate within design limitations of the TCD. Recommendations during TCD commissioning tests indicated that the TCD testing should be conducted after the last unit is uprated to verify operation at the new unit loading levels.

Reclamation reported that a rough estimate of the water leaking from the outlet works at Shasta was completed. Approximately 17 cfs is leaking from each of 3 outlet works. (A coaster gate is guarding the fourth outlet work that contains the broken tube valve.) This equates to 34 AF per day and at 400 KWh per AF, 13.6 MWh of foregone generation per outlet or 40.8 MWh per day. At \$50/MWh, this equals \$2,040 per day in lost generation. Each additional coaster gate would cost nearly \$1 million. Prior to releases that were made for fishery purposes (pre-TCD), the outlet work tube valves leaked, too, but sealant was applied (with guard gate in position) to prevent such leaks. Such an option cannot be used now since the only guard gate within the MP Region is already being used at Shasta. Should it become available, the sealant option would likely be employed.

With the expiration of the PG&E contract coming next year, and therefore the safety net under which the CVP was operated going away, Reclamation will begin evaluating “failure to start” records and other related events to determine remedies that can be completed before real time operation of the CVP commences. The T/C will be kept informed of this study.

Responding to a question about the New Melones runners also being on the RAX list, Reclamation responded that the power customers contributed funds for “runners only”. Other work that is necessary make up that portion of the funding that is listed on the RAX list.

**5. Action Items from Governance Board** – No Governance Board items. However, T/C needs to submit FY2006 Funding Plan to GB at February 20, 2003, meeting.

**6. Accept New Action Items**

**01/16/2003-01** 1992 Efficiency Study Revisit. Western presented their April 8, 1999, update to the Power Engineer’s 1992 efficiency study. Of the potential projects analyzed, it appears that 2 still are viable. These are the Gianelli plant speed conversion and Keswick splash board projects. Reclamation indicated they would review these plus a feasibility of Lewiston splash boards to determine cost/benefit ratios.  
**OPEN**

**01/16/2003-02** Additional Powerformer Funding. The T/C was requested by Reclamation’s Folsom Area Office to consider providing additional funds to cover administration, construction management, design review and approval activities associated with the Powerformer. T/C members pointed out that they “went the extra mile” last year in going back to their Boards/Commissions to get approvals to condense a 3 year funding program into 2 years (at Reclamation’s request). In addition, it was pointed out that as a condition of proceeding with the Customer Funding Agreement, Reclamation had agreed to utilize 50% of the “headroom” of the appropriations no longer needed for power (since they were provided by power customers) to be applied to Reclamation power-related projects.

This is clearly a power-related project and the power customers felt that Reclamation should commit the \$400,000 needed in order to gain the \$7.2 million the customers are providing to the Powerformer. The T/C members did indicate that while the \$7.2 million is an estimate contract price and savings achieved upon award could be considered for use to cover other Reclamation Powerformer cost; the T/C felt these would be better preserved to cover Powerformer contract contingencies. The T/C recommended that Reclamation give strong consideration to funding the "other" costs of the Powerformer with appropriations to honor Reclamation's commitment as its part of the funding agreement.

**CLOSED**

## **7. Prioritize Action Items**

## **8. Address Open Action Items:**

**08/21/2002-02** Western Amendment #3 to Funding Agreement. Minor word edits were made to the current draft to including incorporating the essence of Reclamation's solicitor's comments by inserting "and recovered over the life of the asset. " at the end of 8.1.3 to clarify the intent that CIP funding is amortized over the life of the equipment and no longer expensed in one year. The T/C accepted the changes and agreed that the Amendment 3 should be moved up to the Governance Board for acceptance (subject only to no further comments being received in the interim). - **CLOSED**

**11/19/2002- 01** FY06 Funding Plan - Discussion of Reclamation's FY06 proposed funding plan amounts was completed. The FY2006 Alternative as presented by Reclamation was accepted with a change being made to Item 11 Reclamation Component to reduce the discretionary GB funds to \$11,000,000 recognizing \$4 million of that will be committed to Carr runners leaving \$7 million to be considered for RAX projects during FY2005 meetings. Western had no requests for FY2006 funding indicating they had not started FY2006 budgeting. Western indicated they may have requests by the next T/C Meeting. Reclamation indicated that a funding plan that did not contain a Western Component increases the risk to the customer's ability to fund Reclamation's RAX program (Item 11) as such funds would likely be reprogrammed for Western use in the future. Secondly, Reclamation felt a Western/Reclamation project priority list should be developed by the T/C to deal ahead of time on which projects should be cut if funding shortfalls develop. Until such time as Western provides their project funding needs, this priority list cannot be developed. **OPEN**

**11/19/2002-02** Shasta Rewind Contract Amendment. Reclamation reported that a draft Amendment 2 was sent to Western and should be sent out to modify the Shasta Rewind Contract to include runners for Units 1

and 2 as well as provisions to allow modification/replacement of the iso-phase bus. This amendment is within the funding originally provided by the power customers as significant cost savings have been achieved to date with the rewinds and runners for U3, U4, and U5. (Editorial note: In addition, Reclamation intends to amortize the associated runner and winding costs provided under this agreement.) Reclamation will keep the T/C informed as to the progress of this contract amendment. **CLOSED**

## **9. Future Meetings**

TC Meeting	February 13, 2003	Western	9:30 am
GB Meeting	February 28, 2003	Western	10:00 am